APRIL 1975

Founded 1921 by R. Palme Dutt

LABOUR MONTHLY

A MAGAZINE OF LEFT UNITY · 30p

Fenner Brockway
Great Summit Chance

Bert Pearce
Common Market—No!

Bill Ronksley
From Social Contract to Wage Control

Andrew Rothstein
Tory Lies About Soviet Trade Unions

Mary Abbott : Frances Dean : Jürgen Kuczynski
Pauline Robinson : Brian Bunting : John Tarver

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY

Associate Editor: R. Page Arnot Managing Editor: Nicola Seyd

VOL 57 No 4 APRIL 1975

CONTENTS

		Page
Greatest Chance Since World War Two	**Fenner Brockway**	145
Get Britain Free from Common Market Chains	**Bert Pearce**	149
This is Labour Party Policy		152
Tributes to R. Palme Dutt: *David Leadbetter* and *Colonel Alexei Nikitin*		156
'In Memory of RPD'. Special fund		156
From the Social Contract to Wage Control	**Bill Ronksley**	157
Tory Lies about Soviet Trade Unions	**Andrew Rothstein**	161
International Women's Year	**Mary E. Abbott** and **Frances Dean**	165
Vietnam: Liberation Supplies		168
Southern Africa	**Brian Bunting**	171
Education Cuts? Or Socialism?	**John Tarver**	175
An Ecological Look at Planning our Environment	**Pauline Robinson**	178
Correspondence: 'Women's Hunger Marches', *Horace Green*; 'Belfast Shipyard', *Kathleen Murray* and *Betty Sinclair*		183
Marxist History—The Blacksmiths	**Jürgen Kuczynski**	184
Book Reviews: 'Revolt to Revolution', Michael Elliott-Bateman and others: *William Pomeroy*; 'Poor Men's Guardians', Stanley Harrison: *Alan Brown*; 'The Marvellous Mongolian', James Aldridge: *Hilda Vernon*; 'Voice No Mystery', Georges Cunelli: *Harry Francis*; 'Finland 1939-40', Anthony Upton: *Pat Sloan*		186
Publications Received		191
Fifty Years Ago		191
Fruits of Planning	**Nicola Seyd**	192

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GREATEST CHANCE SINCE WORLD WAR TWO

Fenner Brockway

THIS year, 1975, gives us the greatest opportunity for peace which we have had since the second world war. This summer the resumed Summit Conference for European Security and Co-operation will meet at Helsinki. I shall understand if this fact does not stir the mind or emotions of any reader. We have become sceptical of conferences. How many millions of words have been spoken at the Disarmament Conference at Geneva, and with every word spoken the expenditure on arms has risen.

But there is something different about the forthcoming Helsinki Conference. Believe it or not, it is to consider far-reaching agreements about positive co-operation between West and East in nearly every sphere of political, economic, social and cultural life. It is quite amazing how far the joint commissions representing the Soviet Union and its allies on the one hand, and Western Europe and North America on the other, have endorsed plans for common action.

Proposals for security and co-operation were first put forward by the East European countries more than ten years ago. They were aggressively expressed and the West rejected them as propaganda. But in recent years the Soviet Union and the East have shown that they are deeply serious. Against scepticism and suspicion, they have by their persuasiveness and concessions convinced the governments of the West that they are concerned to get practical results. Thus in July 1973, a preliminary conference of West, East and neutrals met at Helsinki and decided to appoint three commissions to explore possibilities.

There was still a good deal of lukewarmness (to put it mildly) in foreign offices and in the media. If we were to believe the press reports which have come from Geneva, we would conclude that at the commissions all was confusion and dissent. The exact opposite is true. Of thirty items on the agenda, agreement has been reached on twenty-four. The progress has been so great that nearly every government on both sides of what was the 'Iron Curtain' has concluded that the results now justify the re-calling of the Summit. This is the list: the US, Canada, the UK, France, the German Federal Republic, Austria, Portugal, Finland, Sweden, Denmark, Ireland, Yugoslavia and all the governments of Eastern Europe.

What are the conclusions of the commissions which have brought

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about this remarkable concensus of opinion? Take first the Political Commission. On seven of the ten principles considered, accord has been found. These are:

1. The sovereign equality of all states.
2. The non-use of force when disputes occur.
3. The territorial integrity of each state.
4. The peaceful settlement of all disputes.
5. Non-interference in the internal affairs of other states.
6. Respect for human rights and basic freedoms by each state.
7. The right of peoples to decide the future of their respective states.

Many of these principles may seem platitudinous, but assertions of intention between governments generally are. The test must be implementation, and before we conclude we shall see that hope lies in proposals to ensure that deeds shall supplement words. To those of us who believe in personal liberty the mutual acceptance of the sixth principle is important. Some will have their doubts, but the liberties which the East European governments endorsed in the Commission on Movement and Information (later to be listed) indicate that new freedoms are definitely contemplated.

On an eighth principle practical agreement has now been reached. At the commission both sides accepted the proposal that observers should be present at major military manoeuvres on either side, but differences existed as to how far information should be given in advance of all manoeuvres and movements of troops. At the recent meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union the Soviet representative is reported to have agreed, and sincerity was subsequently indicated by Moscow giving advanced notice of a coming manoeuvre.

At the important Commission on Economic and Scientific Co-operation agreement was reached on a series of breathtaking projects. The subjects covered:

1. Co-operation in large-scale projects relating to energy and raw materials.
2. Electrical power.
3. Peaceful use of atomic energy.
4. Road networks across frontiers.
5. Unified systems for shipping on rivers crossing frontiers.
6. Protection of the environment.
7. Development of economic ties.
8. Scientific and technical co-operation.
9. Co-operation in transport.
10. Tourism.
11. Training of personnel in economic activities.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These comprehensive projects of co-operation open a new economic pattern for the whole of Europe. We pass from coexistence to actual co-ordination in the major spheres of the economy and transport.

At the moment of writing there is some disagreement regarding the adjustment of existing 'most favourable treatment' treaties, and the problem of mutual social benefits and relationships with the Third World have still to be settled; but the accomplishments of this Commission have been so great that we can look with hope for agreement on these remaining issues.

The third Commission on Freedom of Movement and Information has had to grapple with the greatest difficulties. The West has made a great point of its insistence on the freedom of migration and the expression of ideas. Many of us will desire these, but the West has been illogical in demanding these liberties in absolute terms since many of its governments limit immigration (Britain particularly) and some of them restrict the expression of ideas by denying legality to communist parties (for example, West Germany). The communist representatives have declined to accept the principle of absolute freedom, but considerable progress has been made in particular cases. Agreement has been reached on the following:

1. The reunification of families across frontiers.
2. Inter-marriage across frontiers.
3. Access to printed information (including newspapers and journals) across frontiers.
4. Co-operation in the provision of the study of foreign languages.
5. Free access to and exchange of arts and cultures.

Those of us who have been involved over the years in reuniting families and facilitating marriages across the frontiers will be the first to recognise the value of these extensions of free movement. The agreement for the free exchange of newspapers and journals will do much to establish liberty of information and ideas. There will be disappointment that complete liberty has not been endorsed, but realistically we must accept the fact that progress towards it can only accompany the fuller mutual trust which experience of co-operation should bring.

So we will go forward to the second Summit Conference at Helsinki. On its decisions the realisation of the hopes inspired by the commission decisions will depend. Clearly it will not be sufficient for the heads of state to hear the reports of the commissions and then disperse. Some permanent machinery must be established to implement the decisions and to ensure that the agreements are kept on

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

both sides. There will be those in the West who will doubt whether the East will recognise human rights. There will be those in the East who will doubt whether reactionary elements in the West will participate in the economic co-operation proposed. The Summit Conference should appoint continuing commissions to carry through the intricate organisation required to apply the decisions reached and to see that they are observed. One can hope for even more. Experience should prove that co-operation could be extended into new fields. The Summit Conference should meet annually to receive progress reports and recommendations, and a secretariat appointed to act as necessary.

There is one disappointment which mars the optimism of the commission decisions. The preliminary 1973 Conference at Helsinki asked representatives of West and East to meet at Vienna to propose mutual reductions in armed forces. They have failed to reach agreement. The West wished to restrict reductions to Soviet and American forces in central Europe. The East wanted a percentage reduction all round. As I write, the Soviet Union has made new proposals and there is some hope that agreement may be reached, but even if summer comes and disagreement persists, we must not allow this to destroy the unique opportunity for peace which the Summit Conference will provide.

It may be that we have got our priorities wrong. We have tended to urge disarmament first and hoped that co-operation would follow. In fact it may be that the experience of co-operation will open the door to disarmament.

The Conference for Security and Co-operation can be made the great breakthrough for peace. But let us not underestimate the forces against us: the vested interests which thrive on armaments, the reactionary sections of society which cling to the prejudices and hatreds of the past. It will only be as we mobilise the peoples to demand that this opportunity for peace be seized that our Great Hope will be realised.

BRING BACK, BRING BACK

The *Labour Monthly* office is always glad to receive old copies of the journal to help make up sets for bound volumes. We are on the look-out for copies for the years 1921-36, 1940-43 and 1945-49. Please send any you can spare to our office at 134 Ballards Lane, London, N3 2PD.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GET BRITAIN FREE FROM COMMON MARKET CHAINS

Bert Pearce

THE battle is on. At the time of writing, the precise date which the government will set for the referendum on Britain's membership of the Common Market has not been announced, but the projected timing sets it towards the end of June. We have about ninety days to go to this unprecedented polling day on which the millions of British voters will be asked to make a decision which must be one of the most fateful and far-reaching in our history, a decision which will have fundamental effects not only on the future of the British people, but upon the whole direction of European and world politics.

It is not surprising that an issue which openly places in question the political and parliamentary sovereignty of the country, along with the basic control of its economy, should divide opinion on lines cutting across party political and even apparently social-class groupings. But the curious lines of division, deliberately emphasised by the sensation-seeking media, should not obscure, above all for socialists, the real division of interests which the Common Market struggle is now forcing into the open, through all the carefully preserved façade of bipartisan national unity and parliamentary supremacy.

This is not an intellectual argument between rival groups of academic economists, philosophers and historians. Certainly the jerry-built structure of Euro-patriotism, built on the alleged unique values of Western European civilisation alone against the rest of the barbarous world, needs and is getting its due intellectual demolition. But to destroy this camouflage is to reveal behind it the very solid structure of the modern Iron Heel, the multinational corporations and agglomerates of industrial and financial power whose monstrous creation the Common Market really is.

The multinationals have grown out of the monopoly capitalism which Lenin analysed seventy years ago (in *Imperialism—the Highest Stage of Capitalism*) to be the all-pervasive dominating international forces we know today. The *Times* Annual Review of the top 1,000 companies in Britain now adds to them the 500 top companies in the EEC (which, of course, it calls 'Europe').

These 1,000 really big companies, says the review, continue their overwhelming dominance of the British economy. But, they add: 'More than half of the massive turnover total of £77,378,613,000 was

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accounted for by the *top fifty companies*'—starting with BP, Shell-Transport, British-American Tobacco, ICI, Unilever, GEC, Courtaulds, Esso, Dunlop, Guest Keen & Nettlefolds and so on, down to Tube-Investments, Consolidated Tin, Tesco and Sainsbury.

Here are the real forces who want Britain's political system adapted to their new multinational needs. Already their investments and profits are considered in multinational terms. What is good for Britain may not be good for a multinational's balance sheet. One of the roots of our present inflation and crisis is the lack of investment and modernisation in British industry over the past twenty years. Yet the financial pages and company reports in the press boast every day of the increasing investment abroad made by these giants of British industry.

Rationalisation, productivity increases while output falls, factory closures and mass sackings to cut costs: these are still the methods by which the monopolies of capitalism seek to weather the crisis of their system, increasing unemployment, cutting real wages, bankrupting smaller businesses, so that the strongest can survive and carve up the markets for their unrestrained exploitation.

Today, restricted by the liberation of large areas of the world from their grasp, and confronted by the stable, growing, inflation-free economies of the socialist countries, the monopolies are desperate to pursue their 'rationalisation' policies on a multinational scale. Already straddling the frontiers of Europe with their company structures, and overwhelming government policies and currency stability with their profit-motivated programmes, they now want more direct political dictatorship over their whole investment area.

Democracy is a danger to them. Growing resistance to closures, unemployment and inflation can turn into mass demands for democratic ownership of the commanding heights, expansion instead of rationalisation, full employment instead of sackings, nationalisation with new kinds of planning, new social and financial objectives pressed forward by new forms of democratic control, curbs on export of capital, direction of investment at home.

The combination of industrial struggle and left unity which in 1974 defeated Heath's Industrial Relations Act and wage restraint, and replaced the Tories by a Labour government, can also in the future develop a powerful struggle over the kind of policies which a Labour government should follow to curb the multinational monopolies and move towards socialist planning in the interests of the British people.

So the monopolies have a threefold interest in dragging us into the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Common Market now. First, it would give them more direct power through the Brussels Commission, remote from parliamentary restraint, to push on with their rationalisation plans. Since coalfields or basic industries vital to entire regions will be expendable under these plans, the removal or blocking of possible democratic pressure on national parliamentary governments is important.

Second, it would bar the way to any people seeking to move towards a democratic and socialist planning of its own national economy.

Third, it would unify the forces of West European capitalism against the growing example and economic attraction of the socialist world. And this capitalist economic and political unity is of course the basis for a European nuclear-military strategy to hold back, and if possible, roll back the 'terrible threat' of successful socialism. As Henry Kissinger said three years before his CIA agents succeeded in murdering Allende and Chilean democracy: 'I don't see why we need to stand by and watch a country go communist due to the irresponsibility of its own people.' The big firms, who are determined to transfer basic sovereignty from our British parliament to an indirectly appointed Commission and Council at Brussels, are aiming to make sure that we have no chance ever to be 'irresponsible'.

It is perhaps no coincidence that James Callaghan, the foreign secretary, who is already hailing the 'remarkable advances' made in renegotiating the terms which he obviously thinks will be a suitable price for selling Britain's freedom to the Market, should have invited Dr Kissinger as his special guest when he received the freedom of the City of Cardiff.

Whatever the mixed bag of politicians, publicists and press lords who gather under the pro-Market banner, their cause is that of making Britain safer for the big trusts. And to do this it is the living standards, the rights and future of the vast majority of people—workers, professional people, farmers, small businessmen—which are to be sacrificed. It is indeed a battle between the people and the trusts.

In this eighty-day battle the trusts have all the advantages of money and property, hundreds of thousands poured into the organisation and propaganda of pro-European movements. But this is only the tip of the iceberg. Hardly a company report or full-page advert where some multinational giant does not proclaim the patriotic profits it is making 'for Britain' by its far-sighted investments in Europe. Are you worried about unemployment? Look at the great opportunities our company will offer you in Europe! (Never mind

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that EEC unemployment is soaring too—over four million).

What a dangerous tragedy that the millionaire Marketeers should be able to rely not only on Roy Jenkins and Shirley Williams, but on Mr Wilson, Mr Callaghan, Mr Peart and the dominant right-wing of the Labour government. Misusing the renegotiation game to defy Labour's 1974 Conference decision, with its eight safeguards clearly incompatible with the whole basis of the EEC, they clearly aim to somersault Labour into a position where its government, instead of scrapping Heath's act of betrayal, give it their double-headed endorsement.

The daily bulletins magnifying every microscopic adjustment secured by days of hard bargaining at Brussels serve only to demonstrate that Mr Wilson's 'terms' are nothing to do with the basic issues of our parliamentary and economic sovereignty on which the Labour Party Conference took its stand. These basic questions are

---

THIS IS LABOUR PARTY POLICY

Emergency Resolution 16, Labour Party Conference, November 1974

This Conference demands that complete safeguards are gained in the negotiations with the European Economic Community on all the following points, before acceptance of any terms is recommended to the British public:

(a) The need for parliamentary sovereignty and the right of the British parliament to reject any European Economic Community legislation, directives or orders, when they are issued, or at any time after they are issued.

(b) The right of the British parliament to bring any firm in Britain under public ownership, and to control and regulate industry by financial or other means as they require.

(c) The right of the British parliament to restrict capital inflows and outflows.

(d) The right of the British parliament to determine its own taxation policy.

(e) The right of the British parliament to subsidise food and import food free of duty.

(f) The right of the Commonwealth and underdeveloped countries to export to Britain on terms at least as favourable as before Britain entered the European Economic Community.

(g) The right of the British parliament to control labour movements into Britain.

(h) The right of the British parliament to independently determine its own defence policy.

Before any acceptance of terms is made a referendum and not a general election must be held on the subject.

Before a referendum is held a special conference shall be held which will determine the Party's standpoint on all issues at the referendum.

Card vote—for: 3,007,000; against: 2,849,000

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

already taken as surrendered to the Common Market, without question. All that is being 'negotiated about' are minor concessions on such matters as the percentage contribution to the EEC budget, precise terms for regional aid funds, and amendments to the Common Agricultural Policy. Even on these a study of the facts, and as much small print as is yet available, indicates a scale of confidence trickery which would do credit to a Mississippi poker player. On our budget contribution (now about £180 million per annum, and due to rise steeply), Mr Callaghan waxed almost lyrical in his report of the advantages gained. But the *Times* reports that 'much remains to be settled still':

> In the fine print which lays down exactly what criteria should apply for a refund, there are several nasty bugs. So far as voters are concerned hardly anyone is going to understand exactly what the final formula means, or how it will be applied in practice. Indeed it may never have to be applied because the scheme refers to unpredictable transfers of money in the second half of this decade.

Newspapers in Wales, and no doubt elsewhere, have been giving heavy headlines to every scrap of news about the alleged benefits about to descend on us from the Common Market regional aid funds. Offers of money to finance research into the effects of industrial run-down, or to help the transfer of miners to new homes, have been much boosted. Now it appears that the allocation to Britain as a whole will be about £23 million per year compared to the £500 million our own government already spends on regional policies admitted to be totally inadequate. And this regional aid is, of course, only giving us back a little bit of our own money already paid into the Market funds.

And what do we pay for? The economic advantages of belonging to this great open Market which would boost our employment, solve our balance of payments problem and bring us prosperity? In fact we have joined the Sinkers' Club just in time to allow them to share some of their crisis with us—so that we have a record inflation, record unemployment *and* a deficit balance with the European Six which has grown from £180 million in 1971 to over £2,000 million in 1974.

The argument that having got in we must stay because of the risks of getting out has a special flavour of graveyard humour to miners and steelworkers in Wales and elsewhere. Three of our major steelworks are threatened with closure. Shotton and East Moors have a delayed four-year death sentence; at Ebbw Vale 4,000 jobs are to go

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this year: basically because of a steel strategy tied to a limited output quota set by the European Steel Community at least 20 million tons a year below the level British steel could and should produce. Throughout the two years of Britain's membership of the EEC their Energy Commission has been discussing plans in which coal output for Britain is to be maintained at its present level, but produced more profitably from fewer pits, while South Wales is classed as a 'B' coalfield, one of those to have its output cut by half by 1980.

How many more such fundamental plans for our future are now being processed in Brussels without our parliament or our workers even hearing of them?

> An unheralded and unnoticed legal revolution occurred in Britain on the day the nation joined the EEC. . . .
>
> The British parliament played no part in the preparation of the Community laws. . . . Parliament completed its job when it enacted in 1972 that the treaties and Community legislation deriving from them were to be part of English law and that the courts were to accept the European Court of Justice as their authoritative interpreter. . . .
>
> The treaties now part of the law of England were wide-ranging, covering indirect taxation, agriculture, fisheries, movement of labour, services and capital, transport, monopolies, restrictive practices, state aid to industry, and the coal, steel and nuclear energy industries. In those fields the Community made the law and decided what the law meant.
>
> Lord Justice Scarman, *Times*, October 26, 1974.

> As far as British law is concerned it now takes second place to Common Market law, and there is nothing we can do about it.
>
> Lord Justice Denham in a recent High Court decision.

Fortunately there is something which the people of Britain can do about it by expressing their will in an overwhelming 'No' vote in the referendum. That there is to be this chance to save Britain is itself due to the persistent struggle on the issue by a very wide mass movement, in and out of parliament, over many years. In this movement the clear analysis and stand taken from the start by the Communist Party and by a growing body of the Labour left has been reinforced by the common sense and direct experience of the trade union movement and millions of people.

This powerful pressure has won for the British people the right to decide. But to win the victory on the day, in face of the flood of misrepresentation, scaremongering and bribery, the much wider still potential anti-Market vote must be aroused and organised. This is where we, the millions, have the greatest advantage over the millionaires.

Throughout Britain a new kind of popular, democratic movement

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is springing into existence with the aim of reaching every household, every worker in every industry. To do it in the time available, all the resources of all organisations need to be mobilised. This is not a time for political point-scoring. It is time to win one decisive battle for democracy on which all other future issues will depend.

Under the umbrella of the Get Britain Out Referendum Campaign, regional and local committees are being formed everywhere. In Wales, for example, leading figures of the Wales TUC, the Labour Party and the biggest unions initiated a conference in which trade union, Labour, Nationalist, Communist and other bodies agreed to pool all their efforts. The Joint Campaign Committee is appealing to every organisation in Wales to join in and to form local all-embracing committees. Hundreds of local meetings and five major rallies will be held. Three-quarters of a million folders will be the basic material for a house to house canvass. United polling organisation will be set up to mobilise the vote on the day.

Similar conferences and joint movements have been launched with the backing of the Scottish TUC, and the trades councils and unions in many regions of England. These movements are already expressing strong views on the proposals for organising the referendum, demanding a fair and explicit wording of the question, supporting the claim for votes to be counted on a regional or local basis, so that for instance the vote in Scotland and Wales can be known.

But over all the decisive issue is to use the ninety days to get the facts to the people, to win and to organise every vote. The people's movement to free Britain from the Market must not be an affair of top level committees and rallies alone. Every town and village, every factory and pit needs its committee, its meetings.

Let no one in the labour movement think this is a political propaganda exercise in which the result does not matter because it will still be capitalism, in the Market or out. There were those, forty years ago, who made the same mistake of seeing no difference between fascism and any other form of capitalist rule. They had to learn the hard way that it was the united struggle to assert democracy and defeat fascism which was the next stage for all progress.

Today it is the unity to defeat the monopolies and the Market which will decide the direction of our future. Clearly the labour movement has a vital role to play. Equally clearly, the forces for victory must include all who stand on this issue for the freedom of Britain, be they voters on Tory, Liberal or the rest, religious, social or youth organisations: this is our battle. It is a battle we can and must win.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DAVID LEADBETTER
Canada

Nearly two months have passed since the sad loss of R. Palme Dutt. I would like to pay my deepest respects together with the thousands who have already done so. I give thanks for this great man who has done so much for us all throughout the world.

This last October I was elected to the City Council of Edmonton, Alberta, at 27 the youngest alderman on the Council of thirteen. This work has kept me extremely busy but never so busy as to take me away from *Labour Monthly* or RPD's other writings. I hope to see much more of *Labour Monthly* in the steadfast and brilliant tradition of R. Palme Dutt.

COLONEL ALEXEI NIKITIN (Retired)
Presidium Member, Soviet War Veterans Committee

I express my deep sympathies on the passing of Comrade Dutt, outstanding Party leader.

'In Memory of RPD'

'Our branch has held meetings for more than 25 years based on "Notes of the Month", and we feel his passing as a personal loss to us all': Fleetwood Branch Communist Party, Lancashire, whose contribution was recorded in the March *LM*. 'I was introduced to *LM* a couple of years back by enjoying the film, *Fifty Fighting Years*, and was impressed by all of you whom I saw in it—especially RPD': Kenneth B. Stump, Brighton. 'His internationalism never wavered. As he wrote in his first editorial, he truly saw "the situation of labour in any country as part of the international situation". No matter how confused others have become on questions of "sovereignty", Palme Dutt always saw the precise nature of the struggle': Betty Whittenbury, Brighton. 'It was decided to send this collection from our AGM to be included in the fund in memory of R. Palme Dutt': St Mary's and Swaythling Communist Party Branch, Southampton. 'Please accept this small token of our respect for RPD': Stirling University Communist Party. 'To help in the struggle, and in small tribute to RPD and to you all': Anon (Leicester).

£50

K Stump £2, Anon £10, Betty Whittenbury £3, A S Walker £5, A Morgan £1, D Grey £2, L Maddison £1, G Evans £5, Ted and Dorothy Light £5, St Mary's and Swaythling Branch £3.50, 'Arbee' £2, J Godfrey £1, Stirling University Branch £2, E and S Turner £2, G Husbonds £3, Anon (Leicester) £1, West Ham North CP 50p, W J Glennie £1.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FROM THE SOCIAL CONTRACT TO WAGE CONTROL

Bill Ronksley
President
Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen

THE defeat of the Heath government by the miners and their allies was not only a defeat for the Tories—it was also a great victory for the left in so far as the right-wing Labour leaders were forced to recognise that at least at that moment in time it was not possible to control the unions and wages by law. Unfortunately, many on the left were hoodwinked into believing that their right-wing colleagues had learned their lesson and had accepted that free collective bargaining conducted by trade unions unfettered by the process of law was the way forward. How wrong they were!

Following the defeat of the Tory government, right-wing Labour had no alternative but to agree to the miners' settlement—in fact some of them even claim credit for it! Having got the miners' settlement out of the way right-wing Labour again came out of its shell and attempted to explain the crisis as being due in the main to high wages and world wide inflation. They failed to explain why the crisis is confined to the capitalist world and why there is no such crisis in the socialist world.

Again, right-wing Labour has played its traditional role of attempting to manage capitalism rather than lead the working class to a new socialist society. It is this lack of understanding of right-wing Labour by many on the left which was responsible for many of them co-operating with their right-wing colleagues in drawing up and attempting to apply the 'social contract'.

At the 1974 TUC the technicians' (AUEW-TASS) delegation was successfully pressed by the platform to withdraw its motion before Congress which conditionally accepted the social contract providing there was large scale redistribution of incomes and wealth; massive increase in house building, particularly rented housing; municipalisation of rented property; public ownership of land required for building; permanent price control; improved social services; extension of public ownership; and substantial cuts in defence costs. In making his plea to the AUEW-TASS delegation to withdraw the motion, Len Murray, general secretary of the TUC, said: 'If you are at this stage prepared to withdraw your resolution, I will give you an assurance on behalf of the General Council that the eight points will

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be pursued with this government.' Undoubtedly, the assurance given by Len Murray to Congress was very important, and I have no doubt that the outcome of the representations made by the General Council to the government will be responsible for a considerable amount of discussion at the 1975 TUC.

In the period following the 1974 TUC, the government has departed from a number of points contained in the AUEW-TASS motion, namely, Healey's massive budget handout of £1,600 million to big business; Mason's phoney arms cuts which cut the previous Tory government's estimates by £300 million but in fact increased arms estimates from £3,600 million in 1975 to £3,800 million in 1977; further public ownership given a low priority; cuts in social services, including education; and the failure of Shirley Williams effectively to use her powers to control prices.

One of the main claims made on behalf of the social contract is that it is a voluntary arrangement which will not interfere with free collective bargaining. The hollowness of this claim may be seen from the introduction to the social contract which states: 'This statement of policy was adopted by the TUC General Council on June 26, 1974, and was sent to all the TUC's affiliated organisations, their *attention being specifically drawn to the recommendations in paragraph 34 which sets out the policies the General Council will expect the unions to observe* when the Pay Board is abolished' (emphasis added—B.R.). So we have it in a nutshell: '. . . the General Council will expect the unions to observe. . . .' Even the most blatant right-winger must have difficulty in describing this as the appropriate language for a so-called voluntary arrangement.

In the near future an increasing number of trade union negotiators are going to find themselves in an invidious position when attempting to hold down their members' earnings in line with TUC policy whilst the government is seen to be 'welshing' on its part of the so-called bargain.

These are the conditions of possible conflict between the government and the trade union negotiators, on the one hand, with the rank and file trade unionists on the other—in other words, the ingredients for a failure of the Labour government, a weakening of the trade union movement and the return of what may be an even more right-wing Tory government than the government under the premiership of Ted Heath.

Following their short breathing space, right-wing leaders are now emerging from their respective lairs and launching attacks on those who are alleged to have broken through the social contract, or are

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about to do so. It is interesting to note that some of them, including the prime minister and the chancellor of the exchequer, are redefining the social contract without the apparent agreement of their TUC partner. Some contract!

Healey, when speaking in Leeds in January, said: 'It is far better that more people should be in work—*even if that means accepting lower wage settlements on average*—than that those lucky enough to keep their jobs should scoop the pool, while millions are living on the dole.'

Mrs Shirley Williams came forward with an interesting version of free collective bargaining (*Hansard*, December 2, 1974) when she argued that in the event of workers negotiating settlements outside the social contract, then the employers concerned should pay a tax on same.

The last straw comes from Harold Wilson who is reported as saying at a Labour Party meeting, held in Taunton on March 9, that an excessively large settlement (for the railworkers) could mean cuts in services and loss of jobs. Harold Wilson's comments immediately before the commencement of negotiations on pay between the railway trade unions and the British Railways Board negotiators are tantamount to an instruction to the latter to take a tough line. It will be noted that Harold Wilson's speech followed a recent speech in similar vein made by Tony Crosland, secretary of state for the environment, at a meeting of the North Lincolnshire Society of Quantity Surveyors. The entire labour movement should make it quite clear to Harold Wilson and Tony Crosland that they will not tolerate the threatened cut-back in the rail system and services, should the railworkers succeed in obtaining a just settlement.

In the same speech, Harold Wilson also threatened the miners when he said: 'The coal industry has to be economic and competitive—and, with the recent settlement, its competitive margin has already narrowed. Otherwise government—any government—will be compelled to cut those losses on coal development and place massive orders for nuclear power generating stations at the expense of the future of coal.'

The British people are fully aware of the bankruptcy of Tory and Labour governments alike, particularly in regard to transport and coal. Wilson would not have dared to have uttered such threats but for the fact that the social contract is already weakening the trade union unity, so much to the fore in recent times. Wage restraint is claimed by right-wingers and Tories alike to be the antidote for inflation, but in the TUC—Labour Party Liaison Committee document on the relationship of wages to inflation, and the strategy

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to deal with inflation which laid the basis for, and gave birth to, the social contract it was stated:

> It must be a strategy which takes full account of the one irrefutable fact which has been so clearly highlighted by the freeze—namely, that wages and salaries are very far indeed from being the only factor affecting prices. It has not been the farm worker, for example, who has been responsible for rising food prices, nor has he shared in the higher farm profits which have resulted. Likewise, it has not been workpeople and their families who have been responsible for rising rents. And it is surely time it was properly understood that in the composition of consumer prices as a whole wages and salaries account for only 40 per cent—with profits, rents and other trading income accounting for 25 per cent, and imports and taxes on expenditure each accounting for 15 and 20 per cent. Moreover, the level of wages and salaries in Britain is no more than about average for industrial countries—and their rate of increase for the last decade has been below the average.

Bert Ramelson, in his excellent pamphlet, *Social Contract: Cure-All or Con-Trick?*, points out that there is no need to pass on wage increases with an annual productivity rate of only three per cent, but if they are then they represent a very small and marginal part of the increases in prices and services generally. So we have the social contract projecting this least relevant factor—wages—as the main target for attack in dealing with what is indeed a major problem—inflation.

The social contract is also claimed, like all previous wage restraint policies, to be an alternative to mass unemployment. But in 1961, Selwyn Lloyd's 'wage pause' led to one million being unemployed; and Wilson's wage freeze in 1966 led to 500,000 unemployed being accepted as a 'norm'. It is significant that unemployment did not return again to over one million as a result of the Tory wage restraints and this was undoubtedly due to the increased spending power in working class pockets arising from the victory of the miners in 1972 and the victories won by many other workers.

Healey also expressed bewilderment that unemployment did not rise as fast as he had expected, arising from the attacks on living standards contained in his March 1974 budget. However, coinciding with the ending of threshold payments under Phase 3 of the former Counter Inflation Act, the number of unemployed has jumped from 653,000 in November 1974 to 800,000 at the present time—and it is still rising.

In spite of repeated outbursts by certain right-wing Labour leaders alleging that many workers are settling their wage claims outside the social contract, the fact is that the majority of workers are settling within the terms of the social contract, hence the failure

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of wages to maintain purchasing power *pro rata* with productivity and the consequent rise in unemployment. Many on the left are now alarmed at the present turn of events and are calling for an entirely new economic strategy and a shift towards socialist policies. Many of them, however, also mistakenly continue to support the social contract.

In the past few years many great victories have been won by the labour and trade union movement due to the development of left unity. The present state of confusion of the left in relation to the social contract calls for comradely discussion between all people of the left. Failure to put an early end to the social contract and to expand home demand by increasing wages and expanding social services would lead to a weakening of the working class movement, and provide the opportunity for the right-wing Labour leaders along with their Tory allies to reintroduce wage controls.

TORY LIES ABOUT SOVIET TRADE UNIONS

Andrew Rothstein

DURING the last few months a Tory press campaign of exceptional virulence has been raging against the Trades Union Congress for its moves to better understanding and co-operation between trade unions in the capitalist and socialist countries of Europe—and particularly against its return invitation to a delegation from the Soviet Central Council of Trade Unions for April. The keynote of the campaign has been the *Daily Telegraph*'s characteristic headline (December 9): 'Comrade Spider, Comrade Fly', a piece of slimy hypocrisy which recalls forcibly some past history.

Fifty years ago this very month, at a meeting in London (April 6-8, 1925) leaders of the TUC and the Soviet CCTU agreed on a programme of joint activity, summed up in two declarations. One stated their aim to be closer friendly relations between them, and to do what they could to bring about international trade union unity; the General Council, moreover, undertook to press the International Federation of Trade Unions (to which it belonged) to agree to a free, unconditional and immediate conference with the Soviet unions. The other declaration, on mutual aid, pledged a full exchange of documents showing the structure and policies of the two trade union movements, with special memoranda on subjects of particular

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mutual interest, and established a Joint Advisory Council consisting of the chairman and secretary of each side, with three members each from the General Council and the CCTU.

This agreement was the culmination of many months of discussion, unofficially within the British and Soviet unions and officially within the IFTU. It was greeted enthusiastically by British workers. But there was a wave of fury in the capitalist ranks. The *Daily Telegraph* had already charged the TUC with 'an almost incredible record of treasonable mischief' for its contacts with the Russians; it now wrote that 'the real cardinal issue is this: whether the British trade unions shall or shall not be Bolshevised.' The *Times* denounced the TUC action as a 'fatal error' which would do 'irreparable injury' to the efforts of certain continental trade union leaders to maintain 'a bulwark against the westward spread of communism'. The Liberal press was just as hostile. 'The real object (of the Russians) is to destroy British trade unionism,' foamed the *Daily Chronicle*, while the *Daily News* accused the Soviet unions of being 'only the political appendage of the Communist Party'. As for Tory ministers, Lord Birkenhead (secretary for India) spoke their mind when he said the TUC's action was 'gravely mutinous' !

Despite this uproar, the General Council ratified the agreement on April 21, 1925: the CCTU did the same nine days later, and in September, at Scarborough, the Trades Union Congress amid great applause adopted the agreement unanimously. The fact that this important accord did not survive longer than twelve months, after the betrayal of the general strike in May 1926, was not the fault of the Russians.

The way for the agreement had been paved by the delegation of the General Council which had visited the USSR in November and December 1924, with three unimpeachably upper-class interpreters, and had published its historic report, *Russia*, in February. Its scrupulously objective study had led to the conclusion that 'in Russia the workers are the ruling class,' and that the Soviet trade unions, while maintaining the *right* to strike, did not need to enter into 'a conflict between the economic power of capital and labour' to arrive at agreements. This at once aroused the indignation of the workers' enemies here and abroad. Just as the attacks on the present General Council for even daring to sit down in conference with its Soviet colleagues had their precedent fifty years ago, so the lies peddled then about the nature of the Soviet trade unions are echoed and even enlarged upon today. And this is all the more outrageous because the International Labour Organisation has itself published

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an elaborate report (*The Trade Union Situation in the USSR*, Geneva, 1960, 136 pp) drawn up by an independent mission of investigation, which completely exposed those lies. Compare what it said with the stories printed recently.

'*None of the Soviet trade union delegates have ever possessed the right to strike*' (*Peter Walker, that ardent trade unionist, December 7, 1974*).

> At no time has Soviet legislation prohibited recourse to strikes. . . . Members of the management violating a collective agreement are criminally liable. . . . In case of violation of statutory or contractual provisions on industrial safety or health, members of the management are subject to fines imposed by trade union officials acting as labour (or technical) inspectors. . . . Technical inspectors are in the employ of regional or district trade union councils and are paid from social insurance funds administered by the unions. Labour inspectors are volunteers elected by the workers and attached to the undertaking in which they work. . . . Negotiations for the conclusion of a collective agreement are carried out by representatives of the two sides of the undertaking, but . . . are submitted for final discussion to a general meeting of the personnel or, in big plants, to a meeting of delegates. . . . Dismissal by order of the management can only take place with the prior consent of the trade union factory committee. . . . A member of the trade union committee may not be dismissed without the consent of the next higher trade union authority. . . . Impeding the legal activity of works and factory committees of trade unions and their delegates is punishable by loss of liberty and by corrective labour. . . . The (factory) committee can approach the competent organisation with a view to punishment or removal of managerial staff who fail to carry out obligations under the collective agreement, display a bureaucratic attitude, permit red tape or infringe the labour laws (pages 53, 57, 59, 104, 113).

Add to this that overtime is prohibited unless the factory committee allows it—and then only up to a maximum of 120 hours *a year*—and ask yourself: 'So why don't the Soviet trade unions constantly call strikes?'

'*The Soviet TUC never bargains for higher wages*' (*Daily Telegraph, that doughty champion of higher wages, December 9, 1974*). Some years ago, in the office of the head of the Wages Department of the CCTU, I was handed a thick volume containing the wage improvements required by the union covering one particular branch of producion, which it had worked out on the basis of pressure from the factory committees, agreed with the ministry for that industry and submitted to the CCTU for endorsement: it was now going to the government's Labour and Wages Committee. 'Who but the union has the machinery

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for working out these scales from the factory upward?' said the trade union leader. And here is what the ILO reported:

> The mission could not fail to notice that the Soviet workers were not so much concerned with the problem of against whom they should use their combined strength as of how they should use it to improve their position (p 97). . . . The Soviet trade unions participate in the planning of the national economy. . . . The trade unions take part in the discussion of all labour and wage aspects (of planning) and the final version of the plan is drawn up after the unions' agreement has been secured (p 98). . . . The wage fund for the whole country and for all branches of the economy is determined at the national level in close co-operation between the State Planning Committee (Gosplan), the economic ministries concerned and the Central Council of Trade Unions. . . . The fund is based on the amounts required by the different branches of the national economy and, within those branches, by the various undertakings. . . . After preliminary discussions between the CCTU, the central committees of the relevant trade unions, the State Labour and Wages Committee and other relevant government departments, the State Labour and Wages Committee prepares draft wages proposals on which the views of the regional economic and trade union bodies, as well as some representative factory or local trade union committee, are sought. On the completion of this pooling of opinions, the matter is discussed anew by the State Labour and Wages Committee and the CCTU. Their jointly agreed proposal is then put before the Council of Ministers (p 99).

This the Tory rag calls 'never bargaining for higher wages'!

Then there is the charge that Soviet trade unions 'are not independent representatives of the workers' (*Times, February 20, 1975*) *and are 'full organs of the state, used to coerce the workers'* (*Telegraph, March 4, 1975*). One of the most striking exposures of this rubbish was made by a Durham miners' delegation, led by the redoubtable right-winger, Sam Watson, nearly forty years ago. But here is what the ILO mission reported:

> When the means of production are no longer privately owned, the place of the workers changes radically, because these means then become the property of the people. . . . The net result has been, so far as the subject of the mission's study is concerned, that the trade unions have come to occupy a prominent position in the Soviet state (p 10). . . . As organisations representing the workers, they have the duty to struggle for better conditions and to promote the welfare of their members: they accept a responsibility for helping to ensure fulfilment of the production plans which they consider to be a means for achieving these ends (p 13). . . . The trade unions take an active part in the drafting and issuing of labour legislation, including laws concerning social insurance, living conditions and cultural amenities. In fact, no such laws can be introduced or amended without the consent of the unions (p 98). . . . The many-sided duties and tasks of trade unions could not be carried out were it not for the swelling ranks of union activists. The full-time staff of the unions

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> is not very large as compared with the volume of work and the size of the country, but the volunteers run into several millions (p 127)*. . . . In the circumstances of the Soviet Union it can be said that, while the trade unions are distinct from the government, they nevertheless play a prominent part in helping to run the country (p 131). . . . This dual position accounts for the considerable power and influence which the Soviet trade unions enjoy (p 136).

In the light of this evidence (and that of many trade union delegations to the USSR) how should one define the politicians and their paid hacks who have recently been attacking the Soviet trade unions? Are their slanders due to illiteracy, stupidity or worse? One thing is certain, they are enemies of detente, who have crawled out of the woodwork now because they know that friendship between British and Soviet workers is the surest foundation for world peace.

* In fact, out of 102 million trade unionists in the USSR last year, over 30 million volunteers were doing some active trade union job often in rotation, and unpaid—A.R.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S YEAR

(1)

Mary E. Abbott*
Secretary
Rossendale Valley Textile Workers' Union

AS 1975 gets into its stride, a new note is in the air as all sections of the population begin to ask what International Women's Year is. This year has been set aside by the United Nations to spotlight three themes: equality, development and peace. For many months, women's organisations have been planning their contributions so that discrimination between the sexes, including economic inequalities, can be tackled, and the status of women lifted to a higher level.

The TUC report that more and more women are seeing the need to hold a union card, this being the first step to challenging the inequalities of the wage packet. At the end of 1975, the Equal Pay Act will be on the statute book and should be fully implemented. As is to be expected, employers have found ways and means, by job evaluation, by giving more points to physical strength, to cheat women of their just demands.

* Mary Abbott is a member of the Women's National Commission of the TUC.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In many sections of industry it is still a man's world. The woman manager or supervisor is the exception, and in the old traditional textile industry certain jobs are kept for men alone. Yet in the socialist countries where women are given the opportunity for training and promotion they are fulfilling these roles admirably.

From their schooldays, girls are given the role that capitalist society expects them to fulfil. Let International Women's Year reach large sections of the teaching profession, and equality of opportunity for careers and training, and equal job selection, can become their project. To many women the achievement of equality before the law will be the goal pursued. The present position of having to get a man's signature before hire purchase is allowed, or when buying a house, reflects again the inequality of the society.

To ensure that men and women are equal partners, facilities for the children are essential. As the government's contribution to International Women's Year, the reintroduction of the day nurseries that disappeared after the second world war, play groups and nursery schools will give the opportunity to men and women who so desire contentment of mind in the knowledge that the children are cared for: men and women can then take an active part in policy formulation at local, national and international level.

I suggest that the promoting of peace is of paramount importance to all women, and the one thing dearest to all mankind.

In the programme already circulated with the events all over the country, many organisations are collecting money for projects in the underdeveloped countries. In Britain exhibitions portraying the work done by women will be in evidence at many libraries. Seminars, lectures and meetings will be sending out the message. The response of local authorities will be determined by the action of groups in each area.

The TUC is organising a procession through the streets of London with a demonstration in Trafalgar Square on May 25. This will be a celebration march by trade union men and women with bands and floats, and as this is the bank holiday weekend many people will be in the capital and be made aware of the contribution of the trade union movement to the emancipation of women.

The United Textile Workers' conference will be allocating one afternoon to International Women's Year. A gold pendant with the International Women's Day symbol will be awarded to the woman textile worker with the best union record; Marie Patterson, chairman of the TUC, will make the presentation. At the Labour Women's conference in June a special document will be discussed. Throughout

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the world men and women will be celebrating the achievements so far, and pledging their efforts to make the United Nations call on equality and development a reality.

International Women's Year has created unity of wide and diverse sections of the population, and has brought to people of different politics, races and religions avenues for working together for the aims of equality, development and peace.

(2)

Frances Dean
Secretary
Manchester and Salford Trades Council

THE Manchester and Salford Trades Council called a meeting last November of interested women trade unionists to discuss the plans for International Women's Year, and from that meeting a committee of twelve was set up.

We were very conscious of the very considerable traditions of work for the emancipation of women which we have in Manchester. It is, of course, well known that the Pankhursts commenced their work for women's suffrage in Manchester. What perhaps is not so well known is the work of the Manchester and Salford Trades Council in the organisation of women into the trade unions in the latter part of the nineteenth century and the early part of the twentieth century. The Trades Council sponsored the formation of a Women's Trade Union Council in 1895 which lasted until 1919 and which did magnificent work in recruiting women to the unions.

With these traditions in mind, our first approach was to put forward a plan for a massive demonstration during International Women's Year through the city. This plan was sent to the General Council of the TUC in the hope that they would consider making Manchester the centre of a national demonstration. However, the General Council decided to hold a national demonstration in London on May 25. Nevertheless, they were sufficiently impressed by our plan for Ethel Chipchase, the secretary of the TUC Women's National Advisory Committee, to attend the next meeting of our committee.

The first open activity planned by the committee was directed to women shop stewards: a conference called in Manchester Town Hall on March 22, with speakers Marie Patterson, chairman of the TUC, and Betty Crawford, well-known engineering women's leader.

Our second project is the mounting of an exhibition of the fight for women's rights which will contain a considerable amount of

(*Continued on page 170*)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VIETNAM: LIBE

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TION SUPPLIES

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*Continued from page 167*)

historical material on the suffragette movement and the early trade union movement, with particular emphasis on the part Manchester has played. This is to take place in the Forum, Wythenshawe, from June 9 to 23. We have now been asked by Manchester Corporation to put the exhibition on in the sculpture hall in Manchester Town Hall in July, and we are hoping to take it to the TUC in September. We are still short of material for this, and would be grateful for any help readers of *Labour Monthly* can give.

The highlight of our programme, however, is to be the parade and demonstration through the city on July 12. This is to contain floats and tableaux, trade union and other banners, and it is our intention to involve all the trade unions and other organisations concerned with women's rights to participate. We already have indications of considerable trade union support and support from the Women's Liberation Movement, the Six-Point Group, the Labour Party and the Communist Party and others.

The demonstration will proceed to Platt Fields where it is intended that there will be a meeting addressed by Baroness Sear, Barbara Castle and Marie Patterson. It is intended to provide at the park various entertainments for the children and for the adults, plays, bands, exhibition by a girls' gymnast team, etc. It is also intended that trade unions and other organisations should have publicity stalls.

Our plans at this stage are far from complete but we are receiving very encouraging support. The Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians (UCATT), for example, which is a union with very few women members, has nevertheless agreed to provide a band. The Manchester Council has been very sympathetic to our request for them to provide the facilities in the park, including a marquee and loud speaker equipment. They have also agreed to give us good publicity in *Mancunian Way* which is distributed to every home in the city, and to put on a reception in celebration of International Women's Year sometime during the year.

The Norwest Co-operative Society Member Relations Department has agreed to give full publicity in *Norwest News* which is printed in 50,000 copies and given to members in the shops. They have also agreed to be responsible for providing the entertainment for the children in the park.

We are now considering the possibility of a meeting and concert to be held in the Free Trade Hall at the end of the year.

On International Women's Day, March 8, a reception was organised in the Society of Graphical and Allied Trades (SOGAT)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

club at which we presented this programme. To give some indication of the breadth of support, there were present representatives of many important unions, several local trades councils, the Conservative and Unionist Women's Association, the Labour Party, the Communist Party, Manchester Jewish Women's Council, the Norwest Co-operative Society, the Six Point Group, the Greater Manchester Transport Executive and many others.

The committee has extended considerably from the original twelve, now having representatives from several district committees of unions, the Greater Manchester County Association of Trades Councils and the Norwest Co-operative Society, and we are hoping to involve more people as we go on. We have been very fortunate in that Brenda Dean, who is the assistant district secretary of SOGAT, agreed to be the secretary of the International Women's Year Committee, and SOGAT has helped us considerably both financially and by putting their resources at our disposal to get the committee off the ground.

Our hope is that, as a result of this activity, the unity forged between the various women's organisations will carry on in the future, and we will strengthen the fight to end the last vestiges of sexual discrimination in our society.

SOUTHERN AFRICA

Brian Bunting

THE arrest by the Smith regime of the leader of the Zimbabwe African National Union, Rev Ndabaningi Sithole, at the beginning of March seems to have been deliberately aimed at wrecking the negotiations for a settlement in Rhodesia. Whatever Smith's motives, the possibility of agreement being reached was in any case remote. Nor was the climate improved by the murder later in the month of Herbert Chitepo, obviously the work of the white racists' dirty tricks department. It is apparent that any agreement reached between the contracting parties at this stage and under the prevailing conditions would represent a grave set-back to the cause of liberation, not only in Zimbabwe itself but throughout the whole of southern Africa.

For any agreement to be lasting, there has to be a meeting of minds. There are no signs to date of any such thing. All the recognised and representative liberation organisations in Zimbabwe, Namibia

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and South Africa have reiterated their demand for majority rule on the basis of one man, one vote, in a unitary integrated state. But in January 1975, the Rhodesian Premier Smith stated unequivocally that 'the government had no policy to hand over the country to black majority rule' (*Star* weekly, January 18). And last November, immediately after South African Premier Vorster had asked for six months to show what he could do, he reassured his followers at a political meeting in the Transvaal that the whites in South Africa would never hand over political power to the blacks.

> I want to say it deliberately and in a spirit of the greatest friendliness to all the leaders of the black people—if there are people who are raising your hopes that there will one day be one-man one-vote in the white parliament for you, then they are misleading you, for that will never happen (*Guardian*, November 17, 1974).

The Nationalist government of South Africa has always based its policies on the argument that there is not, and never can be, a single South African nation. As Dr Verwoerd put it in the House of Assembly on February 8, 1966 (the year of his assassination):

> The Nationalist Party adopts the attitude that we in South Africa have to deal with a variety of nations which cannot be combined to form one nation. They are different in character, they have different origins, they are different in outlook, different in colour and different as far as their standards of civilisation are concerned. In other words, in this country we have different nations which are totally different from one another. . . . We as the Nationalist Party have unambiguously adopted the attitude that happiness for and good relations among the people of southern Africa can only be achieved by means of separation in every sphere, *inter alia* in the political sphere as well.

Premier Vorster has carried on where Verwoerd left off. In a press interview last September he said: 'Where there are vast regional populations of different races and cultures and levels of development, then separate development on a multinational basis is the way to avoid friction and protect each other's identity.' He even had the temerity to add that 'events in Mozambique, Angola and Guinea-Bissau have proved our policy of separate development to be right' (Johannesburg *Sunday Times*, September 15, 1974). For some inexplicable reason, Vorster does not, however, consider multi-nationalism to be suitable for Rhodesia. In his much publicised interview with Liberia's President Tolbert last February, Vorster said:

> In principle, what his government considered to be a solution of the problem in Rhodesia was that 'Rhodesia must be governed by civilised people, regardless of race' (*Times*, February 17, 1975).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is the policy of the opposition Progressive Party in South Africa. What, it might be asked, is the difference in principle between Rhodesia and South Africa? Rhodesia also has 'different races and cultures and levels of development'. Why, then, does not Vorster argue the case for Bantustans in Rhodesia? Especially as, according to a recent report from Salisbury, Smith is coming round to the view that 'there might be agreement if the African majority "seeks an outlet for responsible political aspirations, within their own areas on a provincial basis" ' (*Morning Star*, February 25, 1975).

What all these exchanges reveal is that all the hocus-pocus about apartheid, separate development, government by civilised people, preservation of national identity, etc, is merely a series of verbal disguises to cover up the racists' determination to maintain white domination to the bitter end. Vorster preaches multiracialism for Rhodesia simply because he thinks the whites are too few (under 300,000 out of a total population of over six million, with the gap between whites and blacks increasing all the time) to survive for long as an independent and dominant entity in Rhodesia. He is advising Smith to come to terms rather than lose everything.

Vorster has adopted the pose of 'honest broker' in the Rhodesian conflict for the same reason that he peddles detente between South Africa and the rest of independent Africa—to disarm the forces of liberation and revolution which have made such tremendous advances in recent months and years. When the Caetano regime was ruling the territories of Mozambique and Angola, Vorster voiced no criticism of its policies, and participated quite happily in the unholy alliance with Rhodesia and Portugal which he conceived to be the best way to maintain white supremacy throughout southern Africa.

The events of April 25 last year shattered the illusions of the South African racists and their imperialist backers. Not only was Portugal freed from fascist tyranny, but the Portuguese colonies were speeded on the road to independence. Guiné Bissau is already seated at the United Nations as an independent country; Mozambique and Angola are scheduled to follow suit this year. South Africa, formerly shielded by buffer states right up to the Zambesi, now had the major sectors of its northern borders exposed to direct contact with potentially hostile territory.

But above all, the white racists of southern Africa have been shaken by the conclusive proof of the effectiveness of guerrilla warfare. The brave freedom fighters of PAIGC, MPLA and FRELIMO showed that they were more than a match for the forces of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the enemy. In Rhodesia and Namibia too the freedom fighters have been making progress, despite all the official denials. The automatic assumption of white supremacy in every field has been shattered. Off the battlefield black opposition to apartheid continues to grow in the teeth of all the ferocious measures of repression by the Rhodesian and South African governments. Not only has South Africa itself been racked by strikes as hundreds of thousands of blacks fought for improved wages and living conditions; in addition, the stream of recruits to the guerrilla forces throughout southern Africa has threatened to swell into a flood.

The entire pressure by Vorster and the imperialists to achieve a settlement in Rhodesia is based on their desperate desire to stop the revolution in its tracks. Any sort of agreement which put an end to the fighting in Rhodesia would leave only South Africa's African National Congress (ANC) and the South West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO) still under arms. And with Rhodesia quiet, Vorster and his backers hope the remaining fires can be damped down.

To secure the co-operation of independent Africa in these plans, Vorster and the imperialist powers are beating the anti-communist drum. The mythical Soviet threat to the Indian Ocean is combined with anti-communist agitation against the liberation movements of southern Africa in a campaign to arouse fears in the independent African states that further support for the freedom fighters would be against their own interests. And there is evidence that as a result of Caetano's collapse and the oil crisis, both Britain and the United States have moved southern Africa up to a place nearer the top in their list of foreign priorities. Military, political and economic blackmail are being openly directed against countries like Zambia and Tanzania, not only by Vorster but also by the imperialists.

At the very moment when the freedom forces of southern Africa have reached their greatest strength and notched up their greatest successes, any settlement anywhere in southern Africa which is not based on majority rule *now* will prove to be a disaster for the liberation movement. There must be an effective transfer of power.

And one final point. To date, though the illegal regimes in Rhodesia and South Africa have been taking part in the negotiations for a settlement, both South Africa's ANC and SWAPO have been studiously excluded from the discussions. These two organisations speak for the overwhelming majority of the oppressed black peoples of southern Africa. Any attempt to fashion 'peace' without them or behind their backs is obviously not only a fraud but also doomed to failure.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EDUCATION CUTS? OR SOCIALISM?

John Tarver*

PROGRESSIVE workers have always fought for public education. Education offers the promise of greater control over the environment and the productive forces. It eases the understanding of how society can be changed and it enhances the life of each individual. Early labour pioneers proclaimed: 'Educate! We shall need all our intelligence' (*Education and the Labour Movement*, Brian Simon, *Lawrence & Wishart*).

Thus after the Russian revolution the Soviet government made public education a top priority. Lenin personally directed the reform of secondary and higher education (*Lenin as Head of Government*, V. Drobizhev, *Novosti*). All between 8 and 50 had to become literate. One hundred million people needed instruction. The first words they wrote were: 'We are no slaves. No slaves are we.'

The progress has been maintained. This year the USSR is completing the raising of the school-leaving age to 17, long the practice in the towns, to all remaining parts of the countryside. This is real education on a common curriculum, not luke-warm, half-baked mental meringue. The first Soviet educational decrees were on the 'unified school', and in the GDR the Unified Socialist Education Act has finally superseded the renowned but divisive old German system.

Here our education system is not unified. At all levels it is deeply divided, both between different institutions and within them. Above all, public education is woefully starved of adequate funds. The volume of human knowledge is doubling every 20 years, and 95 per cent of all the scientists who have ever lived are working now. Facts like these show how utterly impossible it is to convey the main stock of intellectual information to the next generation with the educational apparatus handed down to us; and much more than mere communication is required in modern conditions, when the ability to choose among alternative interpretations is vitally important.

This situation was recognised in most capitalist countries after the impact of the first sputnik. The early sixties saw a certain surge in educational planning. Successive government reports dealt with

* John Tarver is a divisional treasurer and regional council member of the National Union of Teachers; since 1970 he has spent several months lecturing among educationists in the GDR.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

higher, secondary and primary education. A great new programme was said to be necessary: big institutions for scientific and technological studies, nationwide comprehensive schooling, a fresh approach to 'half our future' citizens, reorganised junior schools with far richer resources. These plans lie in ruins. So do hopes pinned on them by reformists for some magic and irreversible improvement in the educational prospects of the working class. Since 1968 the proportion of applicants for higher education who are not from the 'upper middle class' has fallen from 57 per cent to 51 per cent. The government has reduced the target for higher education places in 1981 from 750,000 to 640,000. Meanwhile those bastions of the upper middle class, the Oxford and Cambridge colleges, are estimated to be worth at least £200 million.

Therefore it is essential to understand two things. Education remains class-divided and the class struggle affects it significantly, with the advance of militant ideas in society as a whole being a precondition for the redistribution of national resources that the educational service needs. Secondly, the current cuts are but the latest phase in a process of undermining the fulfilment of our educational aims that has lasted for a decade. Of course, the crisis of local government finance has introduced a new quality of severity into the process, but to grasp these two points is to realise that a fundamentally different policy is called for, not only the very necessary opposition to today's cuts.

These are sweeping indeed. One variant in the trial budgets of Bucks County Council included the phrase: 'Close all libraries and museums.' Did Genghis Khan ride again? No, the next line did not go on: 'Hang all librarians'—but highly-paid officials computed the savings and seriously put the closure idea for discussion. And there will be 900 fewer teachers if the County Council has its way.

In neighbouring Oxfordshire the brunt of the £500,000 cuts will hit further education. Supplies and services are to suffer another ten per cent reduction on top of last year's. This strikes directly at the education of young workers on day releases and block courses. The ordinary community will also find it practically impossible to hire rooms during most of the year, wrecking the conception of fully utilising expensive educational facilities. 'Fortified textured vegetable protein' will be mixed in to eke out the meat in school meals, and a week will be added to the post-exam summer term days, when boredom is already a problem, just to save a week's fuel bill in winter.

Such cuts are small beer compared with Ealing's £4 million, Bradford's £5 million or the £8 million projected in Bucks and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reduced to 'only' £3½ million by popular pressure. As usual, Northern Ireland catches the heaviest blow. 'North's education budget slashed by 60 per cent,' announces the press, with Belfast facing a crippling cut of £22 million.

The cuts are somewhat less injurious in Oxfordshire thanks to no excess of benevolence in the county councillors' hearts. On the contrary, the Tory leader of the council fought for 'economising' on 180 teachers in Berkshire before its boundary changes occurred. He lost after a mass struggle of the National Union of Teachers (NUT), parents and local groups. In Oxfordshire, however, a united teachers' committee has existed since 1966. It has secured a proper negotiating procedure (often vague in education, where the concept of employer and employee is unclear to many) and receives early warnings. The cuts finally proposed were therefore more judicious than in many counties, but the NUT formed an Action Committee and drew up campaign plans. Out of the strife a major permanent gain has been achieved. The trade unions with County Council employees (local government officers—NALGO, public employees—NUPE, NUT, the Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions, National Association of Schoolmasters, Fire Brigades Union and the agricultural workers— NUAAW) have formed a joint committee. A firm statement for defending their members and the services they provide was supported by these TUC-affiliated unions, and they will continue to associate.

All over the country there is an unprecedented interest in the attack on education. The organised labour movement has a splendid opportunity to lead. Joint committees can draw parents into the fight in a far more effective way; they can work through trades councils and the TUC's regional councils; they can involve students through the NUS and NUSS and they can influence Labour Parties. Circumstances differ, but it is probably best to begin with joint committees limited to the trade unions catering for the workers actually experiencing the cuts, then to build a partnership with other bodies.

If action is not successful, irreparable damage will soon be done to any prospect we had of creating an educational system fit for modern needs. In December 1973, the Tory Barber cut £182 million off education, which Wilson did not restore. In December 1974, the Houghton Report worsened the imbalance in teachers' salaries with miserly rises for the low-paid within a lump sum of £432 million.

If in socialist countries the picture is the contrasting one of recent big pay rises for all teachers and a rapid expansion of compulsory schooling, virtually complete pre-school care and buoyant demand

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for higher education, this is because of a contrast in the national attitude to education. Nor is it entirely, or even mainly, a matter of spending more. The educationists there openly claim to have developed a thoroughly new educational science. It is based on preparation for work as the chief element in a useful and happy life. But of course we are speaking of societies where skill, diligence and co-operation are esteemed and rewarded. They naturally accord high priority to public education.

AN ECOLOGICAL LOOK AT PLANNING OUR ENVIRONMENT

Pauline Robinson*

FOR centuries people have adorned their lives with artefacts, some representing nature, some works of art, some abstract forms. Many have been very beautiful and much admired, but most people have nonetheless found themselves more comfortable with living embellishments to their environment, or with a mixture, as in a 'statue garden'. Today, in the most congested parts of modern cities, people grow plants, indoors and outdoors. One of the most beautiful city sights is to see the trees and creepers blowing on the tops of New York skyscrapers. It seems that it is good to include plants in city planning.

The older parts of cities grew from villages. The growth was unplanned and slow, and was made to meet human needs. As a result such quarters still seem attractive, despite lack of amenities in the houses and often absence of open space. Key points, such as shops, churches, services and pubs are all 'on the way' to somewhere. More importantly, the distances are short. All domestic needs can be met within walking distance.

With the advent of factories, railways and offices, the nineteenth century saw the construction of mile upon mile of cheap rented property, built to make a profit and destined to become the working class slums of the future. With no relief save the corner shop, no provision for workshops and often no open space at all, the size of these suburbs already outstrips human dimensions, and although the standard of housing is often higher than in older properties, the aspect of the neighbourhood is usually far drearier.

* Pauline Robinson is a biologist working on research into the uses of science and technology.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Against this uniform mediocrity, Ebenezer Howard and the other advocates of 'garden cities' revolted. Their developments were to be cities because there would be industry and entertainment as well as homes and gardens. They were inspired by many strands in late nineteenth-century thinking, the ideas of Wordsworth, Ruskin and William Morris included. The intention was to house artisans in dignity and comfort around a factory in a garden. Welwyn, the archetype, has trees, small unexpected open places, seats and numerous and varied parks. The best of the 1930s municipal housing owes much to this ideal, making maximum use of spaces for grass, trees and shrubs, with hedges rather than fences, and elements of landscaping reminiscent of the country estates of the great houses.

With this example, how did we come to build the appalling barrack-like estates characteristic of so much recent housing? Surely because somewhere between the small unplanned additions to the medieval town, the idealism of the advocates of the garden city and the decent intentions of the city fathers of today, we have lost sight of human need. We build to house the largest number at the smallest cost—NOW—with too little attention to the things other than walls and a tight roof which transform a building into a home. The pedestrian element is ignored, shops services and entertainment are far away. Indoor and outdoor play space and hobby space is inadequate or lacking.

In their attempts to beautify post-war new towns the planners did allow for large amounts of open green space. Mown and isolated, this space is often on traffic islands or down the centre of a dual carriageway and does little to enhance the lives of the people. In *New Lives—New Landscapes*, Nan Fairbrother describes this as 'the fitted carpet complex'. Instead of interesting bits of mixed semi-wild vegetation there are these large expanses of inaccessible grass, where even daisies and speedwells are clipped as soon as they flower and where weedkillers and insecticides are used to maintain the uniform green. She contrasts them with the mature variety of a railway bank.

Suburban areas often contain extensive sportsfields belonging to firms or private clubs, seldom used except at weekends, padlocked at other times. Why not have footpaths through or between such areas? Even arrange for use by local schools or neighbourhood clubs?

The 'green belt' policy, first adopted by the London County Council, saved London and several other major British cities from sprawling any further, and maintained farmland within walking distance of the outer ring of housing. The relationship is, however, strained. Dogs and children interfere with stock, people take short

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cuts through standing crops, farmers move away if they can. Councils try to stop this by erecting pig netting, thus adding to the 'embattled' atmosphere. How much better to separate agricultural space from housing by digging wide trenches or 'ha-has' filled with impenetrable thorn thickets. The pleasant view of farmland would be uninterrupted and in the thicket birds, small mammals, insects and wild herbs would flourish. On their side, farmers could hold 'open days' on which people could visit and come to appreciate that a farm is not a recreation ground but a work space, as intricate, valuable and dangerous as a factory floor full of machinery.

However, if all the green belt were farmland the advantage of preserving it would be diminished. There need to be access points, including parking space and well defined, easily followed paths leading between fields to the wilder parts of the belt. In order to prevent deterioration from constant use, the paths should be under-drained, as on Hampstead Heath. They look natural but are in fact a highly successful artefact. A green belt not only defines the city boundary and provides opportunities for leisure, it also functions as a highly effective nature reserve and as an important catchment for rain which would otherwise fail to reach the underground storage layers and perhaps cause floods. It can include, but should not exclusively consist of, golf courses and sports grounds. In new developments, as well as the outer belt, other areas with specially attractive features such as streams, knolls, clumps of trees, can be retained within the city itself.

Most cities and towns are built on rivers. The tributary streams became first open sewers and were then confined to pipes. Yet, where they still emerge they provide attractive townscape features. Too often, when development takes place, they are filled in or put into conduit, sometimes in response to public demand, on the grounds that they are unhealthy or dangerous. But no one would think of conduiting the Thames at Marlow because gardens run down to its banks. In preserving a varied and stimulating character for our towns, we should surely find better ways of making streams safe than by eliminating them. Even in highly industrialised areas lengths of stream exposed to the day will support a fascinating variety of aquatic life. Larger rivers and canals can be used for fishing and boating and provide highways through built up areas. Much more imaginative use could be made of them when the centres of our old industrial cities are reconstructed. Many could have a linear park with a water way right through the centre, with access from shopping and residential areas. Such parks could provide completely pedestrian

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

communication within the city, augmented by boats.

Not all cities have or are near gravel pits or reservoirs, but those that are have unrivalled facilities for serious water sports, which should be more fully developed. The feeder streams of reservoirs have been successfully established as nature reserves, encouraging the return of species hitherto driven out of urban localities. Large bodies of water put to full and varied use enhance the standard of life enjoyed by the nearby communities.

Railway banks have already been mentioned. Because most of them are over a hundred years old and have been maintained by periodic but not frequent cutting, they are now highways of wildlife right into and through cities. Quite rare plants, an enormous variety of birds and many mammals, including foxes, flourish unharmed. Because of the intrinsic danger of railways, especially electric lines, the public cannot have access, but the enjoyment of train journeys could be enormously enhanced by the production of illustrated guides to the more interesting parts of routes at different times of the year. The popularity of nature trails, even in suburban parks and along disused railway routes shows that the interest is there.

Wide verges, originally to deprive footpads of shelter, are a feature of many roads in the south midlands. Until recently they provided a rich succession of wild flowers, but the spread of weedkillers and mechanical mowing has begun to turn them into 'fitted carpets'. Some county naturalists' trusts, notably Cambridgeshire, have drawn up a schedule of best cutting times and obtained the co-operation of the highway authority in making the most of roadside verges. More local authorities could be persuaded to do this if suitable schedules were compiled for their areas.

However beautiful the city, it will always be necessary to travel from it to other places and other cities. Since we already have motorways, they will become part of any integrated transport system developed by a socialist or any other government. Many of them are at present ugly and dull to travel on. At speeds of 60-70 miles an hour the near landscape does not make much impression, but large features, such as clumps of trees, hills, buildings and so on at distances of one to twenty miles from the road provide an ever changing sequence of views. Nan Fairbrother, in the book already cited, suggested that farmers, local authorities and other land holders should be encouraged to maintain or add such features of the landscape and that highway authorities should employ landscape designers to consider these features and plan for views which would be interesting at the desired speed of travel. If plantations were made

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in accordance with the types of soil, the distinctive characteristics of each region would be apparent from the changing scene.

By having most people living in towns or cities we are able to keep over 80 per cent of Britain as open space of one kind or another. Much of this is wild moorland. Much is preserved for shooting. Much is forest. All these areas could be used for recreation. The Forestry Commission and the national parks do make considerable efforts to facilitate non-destructive use of the areas in their care, but enormous acreages, much of them privately owned, are either never accessible to the public or are being seriously damaged by uncontrolled use for camping, motorcycle scrambling, sight-seeing and picnicking. The labour movement has always been associated with the movement to give townspeople access to the countryside. Cyclists' clubs, Ramblers' Association, Forest School Camps, Holiday Fellowship, the Youth Hostels Association and the Woodcraft Folk have all been part of this, but there are still hundreds of people who either never go into the open country or do not know how to enjoy it when they get there. If we think it is important that there should be green spaces, and that everyone who wants to should be able to visit them, then we must take a lead in suggesting ways in which the often conflicting interests of different kinds of use can be reconciled, and also ways of preventing destruction of the very things which people go to see.

Understanding is an important element. The success of the Forestry Commission information centres and of nature trails shows that people will respond to accurate, well presented information: more of it should be made available.

People need cities, with all the advantages they can confer, but they also need the rest of the natural world. Odd corners of wood and shrub, large and small parks, rivers, streams and canals, can all enhance the built environment and also, incidentally, remove considerable amounts of air pollution. On the outskirts of towns, green belts are a reservoir of wild species and can include agricultural and leisure space. Roads and railways are highways for wild things as well as for people. The organised labour movement, including trade unions, can ensure that in future no area of housing is without a 'wild' space, a sports space, and a quiet space for sitting in. Everyone should have larger spaces within walking, or at least safe cycling, distance, and be able to reach the real open country in less than a day's journey. To preserve all this for those who have it already and provide it for those who do not, we shall have to demand that such considerations become part of planning policy.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

Women's Hunger Marches

I WAS INTERESTED in the piece, with photos, you had on the women's hunger marches (*LM*, March 1975). Mention of Emmie Lawther raised some recollections, for I knew her and her husband, both now dead, in recent years. Talking to them some time ago, I made some notes of incidents that they both were involved in, and we also met another woman, Mrs Airey of Blaydon, who played an active role in this women's march. This story in International Women's Year is a useful one, and the photos for some folk in the north-east, now grown up, who were children in the movement at that time, will revive memories. We have in Blaydon several of the family involved, now adults, who though young then do remember those days.

HORACE GREEN
Ryton, Co Durham

Belfast Shipyard

In the article by Betty Sinclair (*LM*, January 1975) it is stated: '. . . if the 10,000 production workers do not make the yard pay . . . ' Could you please clarify in what way the workers are expected to make it pay. If they are not fulfilling the output expected of them, what is the reason for this?

KATHLEEN MURRAY
London SE12

Betty Sinclair replies:

Since July 1966, when the Belfast Shipyard reached an all-time crisis, when contracts had been taken on which did not allow for such items as rising costs of raw materials, some £68 million of public money has been pumped into the yard, either by way of open subventions or through the ship-building committee set up by the British government a few years ago.

The crisis, even with such huge subventions, was not averted, and accounts for the past two years continued to show huge deficits, that for the last financial year being over £33 million. In the early autumn of 1974, when the question was being dealt with in the British House of Commons, Mr S. Orme, minister of state for Northern Ireland, told the House that a further subvention would be needed, of over £30 million, to keep the yard in production and secure the jobs of about 10,000 production workers.

He went on to state that if the workers and management (*sic*) were not able to show by their efforts a profitable return on this grant, then the British government would have to reduce the grants allowed for social services in Northern Ireland. Mr Orme did say that cash social service benefits would remain at parity with Britain, including unemployment and sickness benefits.

At the same time, Mr Orme stated that Her Majesty's Government were prepared to begin the experiment in industrial democracy, and steps would be taken to permit the election (or otherwise) of worker directors. To explain the whole situation in relation to the Belfast Shipyard would require more space than would probably be at my disposal in *LM*. The yard is geared totally to the production of large oil tankers; it has had quite a number of management changes since 1966; it is not now permitted to accept further new orders; it has been the subject of a top-level investigation in recent months; its production workers only recently won parity of earnings with yard workers in Britain; and its last managing director, a 'whizz kid' from Denmark, Mr Ivan Hoppe, has been recently sacked. He was in receipt of an annual salary of £75,000, tax free and paid into a Swiss bank; his house, on the outskirts of Belfast, when put up for sale, was not to be sold under the figure of £123,000.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Needless to say, the trade unions have protested about the threat to cut the money required for social services, but already the cuts are being put into operation. The five education and library boards in Northern Ireland have been ordered by the British government, through the Northern Ireland office, to reduce their estimates for 1975-76 by some 60 per cent, from £37 million to £14.61 million, and many other projects such as road building, are in abeyance.

This threat will be resisted. The workers are not responsible for the management of the yard's affairs and never have been. The Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions, Northern Ireland District Committee, has called for the taking of the yard into public ownership. The whole financial position is worse than ludicrous. The nominal private capital stands at some £4 million: with the further promised subvention, public capital will amount to nearly £100 million! Where has the latter all gone? How has it been used or abused?

BETTY SINCLAIR
Belfast

MARXIST HISTORY— THE BLACKSMITHS

Jürgen Kuczynski

THE writing of the history of trade unions and workers' parties is flourishing in the Anglo-Saxon countries. Many of the bourgeois non-Marxist publications, especially in the US, contain often if nothing else useful material from archives or press cuttings. But while the American literature extends its interest to the whole world, literature in Britain concentrates mainly on labour affairs at home.

Angela Tuckett deserves our thanks for her third book on the history of trade unionism. In 1967 *The Scottish Carter: History of the Scottish Horse and Motormen's Association* appeared; in 1971 *Up With All That's Down: History of the Swindon Trades Council*; and now the history of the 104-year-old (1857-1961) Associated Blacksmiths', Forge and Smithy Workers' Society*.

The history of its foundation starts on page 54 so that there is ample room for a historic introduction. Thus we learn that the working day at the beginning of the eighteenth century for smiths in London and in Aberdeen was fourteen hours. But how long were the breaks? And how many days a week did they work? In France hardly more than five days because of the numerous Catholic holidays. This brings us to an interesting question not yet investigated (and of course completely out of the range of Angela Tuckett's subject): How far has the rupture with Rome and Catholicism in the sixteenth century led to a lengthening of the working week in Britain?

* *The Blacksmiths' History*, Angela Tuckett, *Lawrence & Wishart*, 418 pp, £4.50.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Angela Tuckett's trade union history is of course written from a Marxist standpoint. Her history of a trade union is also a history of the culture of the organised smiths. The writer displayed this treatment in her *Scottish Carter*, but only in her latest volume has this approach come to full fruition. It is also of great significance that she has strengthened and developed the individual and personal side in her historic writing, the individual and personal side as distinct from general humane aspects. Character traits, the specific attitude of leading trade unionists in the smiths' movement are often recreated in great detail. This is all the more important as right down to the most recent past so many objective difficulties—from demarcation disputes to political controversies within a very small union, but one abounding in strong characters and faced with the problems of parallel trade unions such as the Boilermakers and Shipwrights—were so often reflected in personal relations. To such individual studies belong for example her three apprentices studies from the period of about 1900 (p 123); or her treatment of Daniel Winwood (p 316) who, in 1881, started work in a smithy: here she hints at records of families in which most of the men through several generations were smiths or engaged in similar work. In many of the intellectual and artistic professions, such as clergymen, musicians or highly specialised artisans, generation after generation following in father's footsteps is well known: we may expect to find the same with craftsmen and workers, but not much research has yet been done to show this.

The author's mastery of her subject, not just as a specialist but within the framework of the entire history of trade unionism and indeed within history as such, is exemplified—if I may be forgiven for a long quotation—in her masterly introduction to Chapter XIV, 'The Postwar Prospect' (p 281):

> While trade unionists in general together with their brothers and sisters still in uniform faced the future conscious of their strength, the smithy workers had little cause for confidence. The Associated Blacksmiths entered the postwar period far weaker than they had been after the first world war, with less than half the membership. In September 1920, two years after that war, they had numbered 23,310: by 1947 they were only 11,646. In the second world war they never reached even the 1915 level at their peak in 1942 of 12,801. They no longer held any office in the all-important Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions. Instead of eight Organising Delegates they had only four. They were all too frequently on the losing side in the unprecedented number of demarcation disputes arising from the new tools and technology, and many more jobs were leaving the smithy for good. Was the long decline irreversible? That was the question the march of history had put on their agenda when they entered their ninth decade as an independent union. Could they adapt themselves, or were they to become museum relics like the organi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sations of the lorimers, cordwainers, scriveners and hookmakers? This was the reality of the post-war prospect for the blacksmiths. Yet only a few holding office at district or national level were facing up to it. The older men thought there would be a brief replacement boom during which they expected to get a firm grip again upon work temporarily lost by wartime relaxation agreements in shipbuilding and ship repair, and that they would hold on to it when mass unemployment came and shook out the dilutees. They were making ready to fight the post-war battles of the last war.

But history never repeats itself; change is the one constant factor. It was neither the same war nor the same post-war period.

Thank you Angela Tuckett for this splendid work of trade union history.

BOOKS

Revolt to Revolution
Michael Elliott-Bateman, John Ellis and Tom Bowden
Manchester University, 374 pp, £7.50

THIS IS the second volume of a series with the general title 'The Fourth Dimension of Warfare', the first of which, *Subversion, Intelligence, Resistance,* was published in 1970. The series was apparently conceived in the Manchester University history department out of interest in and concern over the widespread occurrence of guerrilla warfare and other armed revolutionary phenomena in the contemporary period. It is based on a set of university lectures and theses presented in the latter 1960s.

Major Elliott-Bateman, the overall editor of the series, who specialises in theories of 'people's war,' gained his expertise on the subject in counter-guerrilla operations in Malaya. His chief concern, as well as that of others associated with him in the series (such as the Manchester professor, M. R. D. Foot, a wartime intelligence operative in the Special Operations Executive, who contributes a chapter in the current volume on revolutionary struggle in Ireland), is to broaden the purely military outlook of army authorities by emphasising the role of political, social and economic factors in warfare. The series is primarily devised, in other words, to assist the established order in understanding and coping with revolutionary movements and situations.

These volumes are collections of loosely related essays and studies that range rather widely. Contained here are three chapters on 'the age of the guerrilla' and the conditions and battlefronts of people's war by Major Elliott-Bateman, three essays by John Ellis on nineteenth- and twentieth-century revolutions and on 'the armed components of revolution', three essays by Tom Bowden on the background and development of the Irish revolution, Professor Foot's chapter on Ireland, and for good measure a reprint of Colonel T. E. Lawrence's literary, fascinating account of his Arabian guerrilla campaign, 'The Evolution of a Revolt'. The collection would have benefited from an introduction, which is lacking, which might have tied the various themes together and properly focused them.

Taken separately, a number of these essays have value as historical period studies, especially those by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

John Ellis on the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century French revolutions and the trio of chapters by Tom Bowden on Ireland. The tracing by Mr Ellis of the development of revolutionary theory, from an élitist *coup d'état* concept as exemplified by the revolutions of 1848 to the concept of mass struggle with a political vanguard as in the Russian revolution, and his examination of the character and role of armies in the English, French, American and Russian revolutions, is interesting and instructive. Most original and best researched, however, are Mr Bowden's accounts of the falling apart of British control in Ireland in 1914-20, and of the interaction between the British and IRA terror campaigns in 1920.

These historical set pieces tend to be the more satisfactory when contrasted with Major Elliott-Bateman's attempts to deal with the people's war of the modern era. His approach to the subject is indicated by his definition of people's war as 'a form of internal war in which a minority group-out-of-power challenges the minority group-in-power for control of the majority, that is the people.' Coupled with this absurd view of a revolutionary process are broad generalisations that seek to blueprint revolutionary struggles of a guerrilla character that are actually diverse in origin and development.

The Elliott-Bateman approach to revolutionary warfare is essentially the conspiratorial one. (The Comintern, for example, he refers to as 'the Russian organisation for the sponsoring of guerrilla activities in European colonies.') Although he speaks of the political, economic and social factors involved in 'the fourth dimension of warfare', at no point does he elaborate these as cause and background of revolutionary processes. In his whole discussion of people's war there is no mention, furthermore, of the policies and measures by the forces in power that lead to the adoption and step-by-step elaboration of revolutionary armed struggles. His one-sided history is comprised of revolutionary minorities out to overthrow established state power.

One of the curious aspects of this whole volume is that, although the ideas of Marx and Lenin are frequently referred to, and quoted, and analyses are made of the 1905 and 1917 Russian revolutions and of the civil war period that followed, not a single footnote reference occurs to works by Marx, Lenin or any Communist writer. All such references are from secondary sources, usually hostile, that often misquote or pull out of context a Marxist source. In a serious historian, this sets a limit on objectivity and sound scholarship. In others, it is a hallmark of slanted polemics.

It leads, for example, to the statements by both Major Elliott-Bateman and John Ellis that guerrilla warfare by the Soviet people was opposed and suppressed by Lenin and other Soviet leaders during the civil war of 1918-20. Writes Ellis: 'From the beginning the Bolshevik leaders refused to countenance any attempt to encourage any resort to guerrilla warfare,' and 'whatever partisan units had spontaneously come into existence were disbanded and not even allowed to operate in conjunction with the regular units.' This is quite untrue. Extensive guerrilla warfare was employed in the Ukraine and Belorussia against the occupying German armies in 1918, while guerrilla armies on a large scale fought Kolchak's forces in Siberia and then fought in co-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ordination with the regular Red Army to drive Kolchak out. There is a great deal of Soviet historical literature on this, and it is the theme of many Soviet novels and stories.

WILLIAM POMEROY

Poor Men's Guardians, A Survey of the Struggles for a Democratic Newspaper Press, 1763-1973
Stanley Harrison
Lawrence & Wishart, 256 pp, £4

THE PRINTED WORD has always struck fear into the hearts of the ruling class. Twice damned, it has the ability of mass reproduction and of durability, allowing the philosophy, strategy and tactics of revolt and revolution to be both widely distributed and passed down from one generation to another. The working class struggle can thus be continually inspired, guided and led. So there is good cause for ruling class fear, and it is understandable that over the centuries it has made the working class press a prime target.

No weapon has proved too brutal, too crude or too subtle to prevent the spread of the socialist 'word'. The Star Chamber, unjust laws and vicious sentences, the burning of 'heretical' materials, censorship, licensing, the Stamp Tax—all in their day were barriers erected against the advancing tide of working class education and organisation through its presses.

It is one of the great merits of Stanley Harrison's book that, with a wealth of material, he not only lays bare the ruling class methods but exposes their underlying and constant purpose of suppressing the freedom of the working class to speak to its own kind of emancipation. Another is his blending of the battle for press freedom with the political essence of each period.

He takes us from the rumbustious 'Wilkes and Liberty' battles, through the days when the independents risked their all for the right to publish freely (fighting with a doggedness, ingenuity and humour about which it is a delight to read), the great onslaught against the 'tax on learning', the upsurge which accompanied the Chartist years, the developing connections with the socialist movement, and on to the twentieth century and the newer, more sophisticated forms of suppression, allied to the massive expansion of the monopoly press.

What does monopoly control of the press amount to? The flood of relatively cheap, superficially attractive newspapers, the continual limitation and erosion of any real variety in approach or opinion, the careful application of technical advances, the control of outlets and of news agencies, the virtual exclusion of working class journals from advertising revenue (the life-blood of modern-day newspaper economics), the growth of titillation and escapism, the constant vulgar anti-socialist, anti-communist and anti-Soviet propaganda, the non-information and the mis-information.

By the use of such weapons the ruling class has continued by new means the battle it conducted with fire, court and prison in centuries gone by. And when the *Sun* headlined a 'Vote Tory' call at the February 1974 election we saw the completion of a classic, 60-year operation by monopoly to turn a working class organ against the working class. Paper and ink may be neutral, but the press serves one master or the other. Stanley Harrison's story greatly inspires efforts to preserve and extend the weapons which the working class has at the present time, as he warns that 'the labour movement will forget at its peril that the measure of press freedom won in two centuries of struggle has no guarantees in law or constitution. . . .' For so long, in fact,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as the ruling class has control of the levers of power so the possibility remains of turning the clock back.

Poor Men's Guardians is a book with great value in it, particularly but by no means only for the young reader. The only addition to the material I would like to have seen would be a treatment of the trade union press which, for all its faults, and particularly in recent years, has played a role in the political and economic battles of the movement.

ALAN BROWN

The Marvellous Mongolian

James Aldridge

Macmillan, 136 pp, £1.95

THIS IS A MOST original and fascinating children's book. The story takes the form of letters exchanged between the Mongolian boy, Baryut, who discovers a herd of wild horses believed to be extinct, and the granddaughter of the professor in charge of the Wild Life reserve in Wales, to whom the leader of this herd, named Tachi by Baryut, is presented.

All through the two years' adventures the letters cover, Tachi remains essentially a horse, though a very remarkable one—anthropomorphism plays no part. Indeed the grandfather warns the young Kitty: 'Animals are not people. Do *not* put the human mind into a horse's head.'

It is a story rich in sidelights on human beings as well as horses, and it will entrance parents as much as their children. For a child of eight years, say, it will probably be necessary to read it aloud, but after ten years children can probably read it for themselves.

HILDA VERNON

Voice No Mystery

Georges Cunelli

Stainer & Bell, 160 pp, £3.90

IT CAME AS A SHOCK to me to realise that during my own year of birth Cunelli had been busily engaged in escaping from Siberian exile resulting from his contribution to the 1905 revolution! But, a life-long rebel against political corruption, Georges Cunelli has been equally in revolt against what he regards as the crimes of many charlatan teachers, with their so-called secret methods, who expose many promising young voices to irreparable damage without risk of retribution.

The Maestro's approach to voice training, development and classification, however, is very different from the ordinary teaching of singing, whether competent or otherwise, for he is one who applies a scientific approach to voice training and, before giving appropriate advice, questions each pupil in order to reach an exact judgement. His description of how the vocal equipment is examined visually as well as aurally will fascinate the layman and provide the professional with knowledge of most vital importance.

Having spent his earlier professional life as an operatic baritone, Maestro Cunelli, for reasons he makes clear, turned his attention to the deplorable state of voice training, realising the basic need for a new approach to vocal problems. He settled in London after successful results in Milan, Rome, Paris and Copenhagen, and numerous world-famous opera singers, actors and others involved in oral communication have benefited from his advice and training, there being many interesting references to many of them in this book.

Of equal interest to many readers, however, will be his experience in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the movement related to the battleship *Potemkin,* his remembrances of the musical revolutionary Prince Kropotkin, and his recollections of three visits to the Soviet Union during the last decade. In his preface to the book, Paul Robeson concluded: 'I congratulate the author on a remarkable achievement, and can warmly recommend the book not only to vocal students and teachers, but to all who are interested in the human voice, whether in art or in social communication.'

HARRY FRANCIS

Finland 1939-40

Anthony Upton

Davis-Poynter, 174 pp, £3.50

A CLOSE-UP ACCOUNT of that small slice of history called the 'Finnish War', when divested of the propagandist superlatives which surrounded it at the time, is to be welcomed. But one thing here is to be regretted: despite his apparent objectivity the author, at the end, dismisses the Soviet cause as 'bad' despite 25 pages of evidence that the Soviet approach was entirely reasonable in the situation and that only the ultra-nationalist Finns provoked a conflict.

Thus, when he sums up, Upton recognises that the 'Finnish people did indeed display courage, persistence against odds, self-sacrifice and devotion' (p 161), as we were told *ad nauseam* at the time. He adds that the qualities of the ordinary Finn were 'equally to be found' in his 'Russian opposite number' (p 161). So far, so good. But he then concludes that the Finns' was a 'good cause' and the Russians' 'a bad one' (p 161).

This conclusion comes as a surprise to all who have read the first 25 pages of the book. It is here shown in detail how the Finns adhered to a 'Scandinavian neutrality' which the Russians considered pro-German. Hence their request that Finland give 'concrete assurances . . . to prevent the use of Finnish territory by other powers for an attack on the Soviet Union.' As the Finnish government had 'no intention of offering the kind of pledges that the Russian leaders were looking for' (p 18) stalemate was made inevitable.

'There was nothing in the international situation in October 1939 which justified Finland in adopting this hard line' (p 27) says Upton, and he condemns the Finns for 'grave lack of political realism' (p 38).

A great deal of the book is devoted to a military analysis. It emerges from this that the first part of the war was a setback to the Russians for two inter-related reasons. Firstly that the Soviet leaders overestimated the readiness for revolution of the Finnish masses, hence the abortive creation of Kuusinen's 'people's government', so that, in consequence, the original military operation was envisaged merely as an action by the command of the Leningrad military district. This meant a more or less random selection of troops, both officers and men at various stages of training and equipment. Only after the realisation that the Finns took their national defence seriously was the war treated by the USSR as a major operation. Now there followed 'careful preparation' (p 112) and 'the Russians showed themselves bold and enterprising' (p 121). Victory was the result.

However, the damage had been done, and the blow to the prestige of the Soviet army explained both Hitler's and Churchill's underestimation of Soviet fighting capacity in 1941. In the meantime, needless to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

say, the Russians had learnt much from the Finnish experience.

The roles of the French and British governments throughout the book receive hardly a word of praise. Self-centred dishonesty seems to characterise them, and one of their offers is described by Upton as 'basically fraudulent' (p 105) while similar epithets appear elsewhere. Indeed, says Upton, we would have landed in the 'ultimate folly' of war with both the USSR and Germany if it had not been for 'Finland's decision to make peace' (pp 157-8) just in time.

PAT SLOAN

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

Marx and Engels Collected Works, Vol 2. Lawrence & Wishart, 680 pp, £3.

W. J. M. M. Political Questions: Essays in Honour of W. J. M. Mackenzie, edited by Brian Chapman and Allen Potter. Manchester University, 302 pp, £6.50.

Brecht As They Knew Him, edited by Hubert Witt. Lawrence & Wishart, 244 pp, £1.

The Public Authorities and the Right to Protection of Trade Union Funds and Property, ILO, 130 pp, £2.50.

Sharing in Development, ILO, 686 pp, £4.

The Intelligent Radical's Guide to Economic Policy, J. E. Meade. Allen & Unwin, 160 pp, £4.25.

Karl Marx, Michael Evans. Allen & Unwin, 216 pp, £4.60.

Walls and Bars, Eugene Victor Debs. Charles H. Kerr, 286 pp, available on order from Collet's.

Communist Party of Ireland: An Outline History, New Books, 64 pp, 45p.

Chile—Trade Unions and the Resistance, Chile Solidarity Campaign, 16 pp, 10p.

LABOUR MONTHLY FIFTY YEARS AGO

If any split comes in the Labour Party, it will come from the right. The right wing has already shown itself willing to shatter the historic working class basis of the Labour Party in the interests of their doctrines of capitalist democracy and imperialism, and to proceed to the exclusion of class conscious workers: an attempt which the working class movement has repudiated, in fact, with indignation. The right wing has flouted every principle of independence for which the Labour movement stands, voting along with the capitalists in the opposite lobby to the mass of the Labour Party, writing wholesale in the capitalist press attacks on the left wing, entering into open alliances with the employers, and in every way repudiating their allegiance and acting as if to provoke a split of the left, which they probably in their hearts desire. But the right wing does not represent the mass of the movement. The failure of the policy of expulsion, which it has not been possible to put into execution in a single important industrial centre, reveals that the instinct of the masses is sound, and that the tactics of the right wing to break it have failed. The British working class has learnt the lesson of solidarity in a hard long school, and they are not going to be robbed of it in a hurry.

(From 'Notes of the Month' by RPD, *Labour Monthly*, April 1925)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FRUITS OF PLANNING

THE early spring this year has been a pleasant forerunner of what spring usually means to *LM*, the trade union conferences. Not any earlier than in other years, but coming along nicely now and bringing with them a blossoming of some of the best phone calls and letters to our office.

'We sold only 11 copies last year, but that was because we had only two sellers. We'll pass them around more this time, so a parcel of 30 if you can spare them: five per seller seems to be about right. We'll let you have the hotel address and you can send them direct to us at conference.'

An arrangement like that will bear good fruit, the only frosty hazard being our dependence on the post to get the parcel there in time.

As I write, the postal charges are again being increased, to add to the problem. This is a serious threat to *LM*'s price level, since our 'post free' tradition means we must budget to cover postage costs. The charge for sending out a single copy of the journal has jumped from 5p to 8p.

So watch those fund figures, and try, specially during conference time, to bring us some much-needed extra donations from friends who can help if they are asked. Our total for February was:

£85.68

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: 'Oliver Twist' 70p, 'Anon Friend' £5, F Reynolds £10, B D Youatt £3, 'Patrick' 50p, S Morrissy £1, M M and J W M (per L H NZ) 25p, Marie Philibert (plus extra) 35p, N J S Hughes £2, 'Socialist Sailor' £2, Ben Ainley £1, Len Potter £1, K and B R (USA) £2.70, 'S Mill' £2, Les Bates 25p, H Brindle 25p, Blackburn Branch 15p, Oldham Branch 15p, Len and Stella Perkins 25p, A Wallace £5, A Calder 25p, E Dymock 20p, J Rink 25p, R Paul 50p, A Corbett £1, Union of Turkish Progressives in Britain £2, L'Humanité 30p, W J Glennie 50p, W H Laithwaite £5, I J Pearce 50p, W J Daniel £1, J D (Canada) £1.53, J Purton 37p.

OTHER DONATIONS came from: G D Green £1.40, L G Stockford £2.40, M J Isherwood £1.40, A S Walker £1, Mr and Mrs J Kokos 40p, H B 40p, J Russell 50p, J R Hillian 40p, 'In memory of D H Strathern' (from M Strathern) £2, A Collindridge £1.40, H Davies £1.40, A Ramage 50p, C G Couzens 40p, I Rose 40p, P Louis 40p, M Owen 20p, F Quelon £3.60, West Hampstead CP £10, C Sherman 85p, F Wignall £1.40, G H Huggan £1, R Simpson £1.88, D J Wood £1.40.

Our thanks to you all.

Nicola Seyd

134 Ballards Lane, London, N3 2PD (01-346 5135)

Bankers' orders to: National Westminster Bank Ltd, Finchley Central Branch A/c No 37564838, Code No 60-08-20

Published by Unity Publications (Finchley) Ltd., and printed by London Caledonian Press Ltd.(T.U.), Watford, Herts.—56271

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POST FREE SUBSCRIPTION OFFER

for Labour Monthly, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N3 2PD

Home and Overseas (unsealed) 1 year £3.60, 6 months £1.80

USA 1 year $10.00 (sealed $13.00)

Canada 1 year $10.50 (sealed $13.50)

Air Mail rates quoted on application

Please start my subscription from the ..... issue

Name.....

Address.....

.....

Special Student's Concession

1 year £3.30
6 months £1.70

I am a bona fide student at -

.....

Please start my subscription from the ..... issue

Name.....

Address.....

.....

.....

Please make cheques, etc. payable to Unity Publications (Finchley) Ltd.

FIFTY FIGHTING YEARS

the film of *Labour Monthly*

Available for hiring on 16mm from

EDUCATIONAL & TELEVISION FILMS LTD

247a Upper Street, London, N1 1QR
Telephone: 01-226 2298

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(25p a line, minimum 90p. Cash with order to: Unity Publications (Finchley) Ltd, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N3 2PD.)

WANTED—secondhand books on Marxism, socialism, labour history, race relations, women's liberation, Collet's London Bookshop, 66 Charing Cross Rd., London W.C.2. Tel: 01-836 6306.

SOCIALIST LIBRARIES & pamphlets bought. 01-876 7254. Hammersmith Books, Liffords Pl., S.W.13.

LABOUR RESEARCH

RENTS—THE FREEZE ENDS

COMMON MARKET: THE ALTERNATIVES

SHIPBUILDING

THE NEW SHADOW CABINET

20p, or 25½p by post, monthly
£3.06 per annum

LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
78 Blackfriars Rd, London, SE1 8HF

NOW AVAILABLE

Labour Monthly 1974

Bound Volume

£4.50 post free, or—special offer to readers—send £1.90 and your loose copies to:

UNITY PUBLICATIONS (FINCHLEY) LTD
134 BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N3 2PD

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED